

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/030,988	04/12/2002	Francois Dopont	218104US0PCT	9171
22850 75	590 03/22/2004		EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.			YOON, TAE H	
1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ADDAMIDAM, VIA 223	1, VIII 22211		1714	
			DATE MAIL ED: 03/22/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	<u> </u>
	10/030,988	DOPONT ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tae H Yoon	1714	
The MAILING DATE of this communicate Period for Reply	ion appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) de - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statuto - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION. 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reation. 10 sa reply within the statutory minimum of thirt ry period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON by statute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed o	n <u>12 April 2002</u> .		
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b)[∑ This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for closed in accordance with the practice it			
Disposition of Claims		·	
4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the appl 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are v 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction	vithdrawn from consideration.		
Application Papers		* * *	
9) The specification is objected to by the E	xaminer.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to I	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection	n to the drawing(s) be held in abeyan	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) △ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for a a) △ All b) □ Some * c) □ None of: 1. □ Certified copies of the priority doc 2. □ Certified copies of the priority doc 3. △ Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International	cuments have been received. cuments have been received in Ap ne priority documents have been	oplication No	
* See the attached detailed Office action fo	r a list of the certified copies not i	received.	
		•	
Attachment(s)	0		
1) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) ☑ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9	4) Interview S	ummary (PTO-413) /Mail Date	
 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	/SB/08) 5) ☐ Notice of In 6) ☐ Other:	formal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 1714

The recited "possibly chosen from ---" in claims 2-6, "in particular" and "such as" in claims 2, 3, 5 and 6, and "preferentially ---" in claim 8are objected and separate claims with narrow limitation are suggested. Abstract is objected since it must be in a single paragraph.

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The recited "The use" is non-statutory subject matter, and "the method of using" is suggested.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 4-6 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 8-13 of copending Application No. 10/168,389. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the copolymer (acrylic acid and

Art Unit: 1714

styrene in claim 10, for example) of said application encompasses the instant copolymer and the recited preambles have little probative value.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The recited "substituted" in claims 2, 3, 5 and 6 is non-enabling absent particular substituents or functional groups recited in the specification. Cancellation of said "substituted" is needed if the specification does not teach such substituents or functional groups.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The recited "--- that is <u>consists</u> of copolymers <u>composed</u> of in claims 1-6 is confusing and indefinite since said <u>consists</u> is a closed-end term and <u>composed</u> is <u>open-ended term</u>. It is unclear which one controls the recited copolymer.

Art Unit: 1714

The recited "chosen from amongst" is an improper Markush format and "chosen from the group consisting of A, B, C, ---- and Z" is suggested.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over EP 0 737 728.

EP teaches the instant copolymers in abstract wherein 40-60 wt% of (meth)acrylic acid, 25-45 wt% of styrene or alpha methylstyrene and 0-20 wt% of (meth)acrylate are taught. The recited simultaneous adjustment of the water retention of the coating color and its Brookfield viscosity is an inherent property since the same polymer is used. Thus, the instant invention lacks novelty.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Corbett et al (US 4,423,118).

Art Unit: 1714

Corbett et al teach paper coating compositions comprising a polymeric thickener in abstract. Said polymeric thickener is a terpolymer of 45-55 wt% acrylic acid, 20-30 wt% of acrylamide and 20-30 wt% of methyl methacrylate (col. 4, lines 6-8 and 40-49). Reference must be considered for all that it discloses and must not be limited to preferred embodiments or working examples, *In re Mills*, 477 F2d 649, 176 USPQ 196 (CCPA 1972). The recited simultaneous adjustment of the water retention of the coating color and its Brookfield viscosity is an inherent property since the same polymer is used. Thus, the instant invention lacks novelty.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over EP 0 737 728 and Corbett et al (US 4,423,118), Miyauchi et al (US 5,843,566) or Sinka et al (US 4,78,500).

The instant invention further recites coating of paper over EP. However, the use of the instant (meth)acrylic acid copolymers as thickeners or water retention aids for paper coatings is well known in the art as taught by Corbett et al, Miyauchi et al (examples 4-6) and Sinka et al (abstract).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to utilize the coating composition of EP in coating papers with teaching of Corbett et al, Miyauchi et al or Sinka et al since EP teaches a film forming coating composition and since the use of the instant acrylic acid copolymers as thickeners or water retention aids for paper coatings is well known in the art.

Art Unit: 1714

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tae H Yoon whose telephone number is (571) 272-1128. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (571) 272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tae H Yoon
Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1714

THY/March 15, 2004